DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 987 RC 003 221

By-Moe, Edward O.

The Changing Rural Scene: The Rural Setting--General.

Pub Date 17 Mar 69

Note-27p.; Paper presented at a conference on Solving Educational Problems in Sparsely Populated Areas (Denver, Colorado, March 17-19, 1969)

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.45

Descriptors-*Community Change, Demography, *Educational Planning, Industrialization, *Low Income, Occupational Mobility, Off Farm Agricultural Occupations, Part Time Farmers, Population Trends, Rural Areas, Rural Education, *Rural Environment, Rural Farm Residents, Rural Urban Differences, Socioeconomic Influences

In 1920, farm people comprised 61% of the rural population; in 1950, however, 60% of the rural population was composed of non-farm people. This change is attributed to increased agricultural efficiency and to expansion of industry and military services. From 1960 to 1966 the net out-migration averaged 804,000 persons per year from farm to city. Urban dwellers generally have completed more years of schooling, with rural non-farm people next and farm people having the lowest educational attainment. Rural farm and non-farm income has been shown to be substantially below that of the urban dweller. Two major factors seem to contribute to this situation: (1) earning capacities are low; and (2) incomes attained are below earning capacity. The most significant factors concerning small communities as they pertain to the educator are that small communities have fewer children than urban systems have, have a smaller proportion of adults, and have a larger number of older and dependent people. These factors must figure highly in educational planning for small communities. (DA)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED027987

THE CHANGING RURAL SCENE*

"The Rural Setting-General"

INTRODUCTION

One of the major characteristics of the society in which we now live and the one in which we will live in the future is the critical and central importance of education. This is true whether one is concerned about a city, a metropolis, a megalopolis, or a sparsely settled area. The designing of education for the future is a demanding task. Conferences such as this one which examine the present and the prospects for the future and which try to define and to take a problem-solving approach are rich in promise. I am pleased to participate in such a conference. With our overriding confrontation with the city and the urban, we must not neglect the rural, the small community, and the sparsely settled areas. Had we been more aware of what was happening over the last half century, we might have reduced somewhat the burden now placed on the city.

The way in which we respond now will influence not only the rural school and the rural community but the society as a whole and the city of the future. Perhaps even at this late date, we can see our society whole and see the interdependence of its people and its parts. Perhaps we can also develop educational

---

*Paper presented by Dr. Edward O. Moe for a conference on Solving Educational Problems in Sparsely Populated Areas, March 17-19, 1969, Denver, Colorado, sponsored by the National Federation for the Improvement of Education with the cooperation of the Clearing House on Rural Education and Small Schools. Dr. Moe is Professor of Sociology and Executive Director of the Division of Community and Urban Development, University of Utah.

RC003221

systems which will enable people to live constructively in a society, to understand it, and to achieve their full potential through the educational opportunities it affords.

In an analysis of the rural setting -- the changing scene -- I will organize some ideas and data around three major points:

I. An overview of American society and what is happening

II. A brief demographic view of the rural setting and the rural population past, present, and future; and

III. Some of the basic problems confronting rural communities which education must take into account.

The temptation to substitute statistics for an interpretation of what is happening will be resisted. Statistics will be used to describe the pattern of the present and the shape of the future. They will be used to provide a basis for interpretation.

I. AN OVERVIEW

Most of us carry around in our minds a picture of a rural community. Some of these pictures are idealized. Many of them, if not most, are sadly out of touch with the community that exists today and the forces at work within and upon society and the community.

Let me flash on the screen some pictures portraying the emergence of the American community over the past 100 years. As I do this, we will probably

recognize that we still have all of these "pictures" of communities or types of communities in one way or another. These "pictures," however we may view them, suggest the rapidity with which our communities and rural areas have changed and suggest also the nostalgic longing in many of us for a community which is no more.

(SHOW OVERLAYS)

To put the problem of human society, of the rural community, and of rural society in perspective, one must keep in mind first of all that our society benefits from and suffers from a tremendous explosion in knowledge, particularly scientific knowledge and the technologies related thereto. The additions to man's store of scientific knowledge within the last two generations have been greater than through all time back to the taming of fire and discovery of the wheel. Rapid accumulation of scientific knowledge will continue. There are more scientists alive today than all the scientists who lived from the beginning of time until today. More and more money is being poured into scientific research by universities, industries, foundations, government and other institutions including the schools.

Part of our problem today is that we have grossly underestimated what has been happening. We have been poor projectors of many of the forces at work and many of the effects of these forces. For example, we have been:

> Poor projectors of population growth. In 1946, the best estimate that the Census Bureau could make of the United States population 9 years later, 1955, was 150,000,000. By 1955, we had 167,000,000 people -- an error of 17,000,000 or something like the population of Canada.

> Poor projectors of the number of automobiles and all the sundry needs created by automobiles. In 1946, the hard-boiled automotive economists in Detroit estimated that there could be some 36,000,000 automobiles on the highways by 1955. Actually, there were 52,000,000 cars on the road, an error of 16,000,000, or more cars than there were in the 50's and early 60's in all of Western Europe. It is little wonder that our highways are crowded and we cannot find a place to park.

It is obvious that our projections have not been very accurate. This fact makes us cautious now about projections into the future. Nonetheless, we must make projections and we must strive to find ways to make them more and more accurate.

This knowledge explosion is the basis for the industrial, urban, and bureaucratic revolutions in the modern world. It is these forces -- industrialization, urbanization, and bureaucratization -- which have produced a new society, a new rural society, and the rural communities of today. It is these forces also which provide the context within which attempts to deal with the problems of the rural community and the rural school must be conceived. The effects of these forces pervade every aspect of life. Let us look at them in turn.[1]

Industrialization

> Industrialization has increased and will continue to increase productive capacity. There are many more jobs, and the population grows, in part, because there are more jobs. Specialization, automation, and professionalization of various fields of work

---

1. Edward O. Moe, "Revolutionary Changes Taking Place in Society Today," a presentation at a conference on Climate for Change sponsored by the Junior League of Ogden and Salt Lake City, Utah, January 11, 1966

become more important and have a pervasive effect on the whole society.

The pursuit of commodities and careers seems to take precedence over other ends and goals. Occupations and jobs become highly specialized and the central concern in the life of people.

Previous patterns of social relationships between and among individuals and groups are altered. There is an increased possibility for individuals to rise in the social status hierarchy.

Rapid developments in transportation and the networks of highways alter time and space relationships and place men in almost immediate contact with each other -- with all their similarities -- but also with all their differences in ideas and values and life perspectives.

Separation of place of residence and place of work becomes possible -- people are no longer confined within one community but may be involved in many.

Urbanization

Urbanization continues to concentrate population in and around cities and highly industrialized areas where jobs are located.

Suburbs develop around cities, tending to accelerate the urbane, the sophisticated, the cosmopolitan.

The expanding array of opportunities creates a new pattern with a new tempo and a new perspective.

There is a shift in emphasis from sacred and traditional ideas and values to secular, rational and humanistic ones.

Population becomes increasingly diversified.

Different ethnic groups, different races -- people with different backgrounds -- are brought into close contact with each other.

Confusion and conflicts in values emerge -- particularly in the transitional periods -- in part accelerated by recognition of the significance of differences and an increasing value placed on differences and individuality.

Education becomes critically important as man attempts to adjust, to accommodate to a new way of life with its impelling demands.

There is a greatly increased emphasis on consumption. Levels of living and levels of expectations rise -- and frequently the rise is dramatic.

Bureaucratization

Bureaucratization is the other major force at work in our society and elsewhere in the world. This is an essential and logical development in an affluent and complex society.

There is a great increase in the number of groups and organizations. Size and complexity have substantially increased.

Groups and organizations have become highly specialized, leading to fragmentation both within the organization and within the community which creates a complex problem of coordination.

There is an emphasis on hierarchy -- and frequently a different kind of hierarchy tends to emerge and becomes more pervasive in some senses and perhaps less so in others, as attempts are made to implement egalitarian ideas.

Interdependence in all parts of life and in all parts of the population becomes a fact even if it is unrecognized by some. This includes not only people within a given community or within a state, but the interdependence of people within the nation, and this can be pushed up to the world level.

The importance of centers of influence outside communities, states and even outside the nation on affairs within the encompassed units greatly increases -- most of the larger industries and organizations in Utah, for example, have their regional and national offices outside the state.

There is greatly increased pressure for efficiency, for rationality, for impersonalness. This, together with some of the factors mentioned above, leads to the "organization-man" phenomenon and to personal feelings of remoteness, impersonalness, and powerlessness.

These forces at work in American society and their far-reaching effects make new demands on individuals and complicate the environment in which we must live and work. This complication of the environment also enhances the

pressures and demands upon individuals. "And to survive this revolution in science and technology," said Adlai Stevenson, "education, not wealth and weapons, is our best hope -- that largeness of vision and generosity of spirit which spring from contact with the best minds and treasures of our civilization."[2]

II. BRIEF DEMOGRAPHIC VIEW OF THE RURAL SETTING

With the overview presented in the previous section, we can now examine the rural population in relation to the total U.S. population. Attention will be centered on:

1. numbers and percentages -- urban, rural, rural farm, and rural non-farm
2. migration
3. regional changes
4. participation in the labor force -- industrial-occupational composition
5. age and sex structure
6. educational achievements
7. income and poverty

Population Numbers - Projections

The American population has always been characterized by rapid growth. It doubled three times at 25 year intervals between 1790 and 1865. It doubled

---

2. "The Plight of Humanities," Editorial Projects for Education, 1965, quoted in Status Report on Continuing Education Programs in California Higher Education, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Publication No. 1021, November 1965, page 13

again in the 35 year period from 1865 to 1900, and doubled once more in the 50 year period from 1900 to 1950.[3] From 151 million in 1950, it increased to some 194 million in 1965 and is projected to increase to 241 million by 1980. This will mean a gain of some 47 million persons in the 15 years from 1965 to 1980 or a percentage increase of about 24%. The increase, while substantial,will be at a slightly lower rate than the 28.1% change from 1950 to 1965. The Bureau of Census projections for 1980 range from a low of 225 million to a high of 249 million.[4]

Population Change for the United States
1950-1980

Population			Percent Change		
1950	1965	1980	1950-65	1965-80	1950-80
151,326,000	193,818,000	241,133,000	28.1	24.4	59.3

Rural -- Rural Farm Population

In 1790, 19 in every 20 Americans were in the rural population. As the nation developed, the rural population expanded steadily. The rural population was larger than the urban for nearly one and one-third centuries or until 1920. In the decennial census of that year, 54.3 million were urban as compared with 51.8 million rural.[5]

---

3. Philip M. Hauser and Martin Taitel, "Population Trends - Prologue to Educational Programs," page 36 in Edgar L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan (ed.) Prospective Changes in Society by 1980, Citation Press, New York 1967

4. Op. Cit., page 24. See also Urban and Rural America: Policies for Future Growth, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C. April 1968

5. Rural Poverty in the United States, a report by the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, Washington, D.C., May 1968, page 3

There has always been a tendency to equate rural population with farm population. The rural population has always included substantial numbers of people who were employed in non-agricultural pursuits such as mining, manufacturing, trades and services, construction, and recreation. These rural non-farm people live in villages of less than 2,500 people and in the open country.

Not only has the urban population of the country increased dramatically since 1920, the rural non-farm population has increased steadily also. In 1920, for example, farm people comprised 61% of the rural population. This was down to 40% by 1950, with 60% of the rural population being made up of non-farm people. The rapid mechanization of agriculture, the increases in agricultural efficiency, military service, the expansion of industrial activity, and the development of non-farm population in the country led millions of people to abandon agriculture.

The figures below summarize what has happened since 1940 and what is projected to 1980. Rural farm population declined from 23% of the total population in 1940 to 15% in 1950 to 7% in 1960 and is expected to decline to 4% by 1980. Over the 20 years from 1940 to 1960, rural non-farm population, while it has increased as a proportion of the rural population, has changed only from 21 to 23% of the total population. From 1960 to 1980, it will decline to 16% of the total. The urban population in 1980 will comprise 80% of the total U.S. population.

Percentage of Urban and Rural Population in the United States
1940-1980

	Urban	Rural	Rural Non-farm	Rural Farm
1980	80%	20%	16%	4%
1960*	70%	30%	23%	7%
1950	64%	36%	21%	15%
1940	56%	44%	21%	23%

*New definition of rural. In the 1960 Census, the farm population consists of persons living in rural territory on places of 10 or more acres from which sales of farm products amounted to $50 or more in 1959 or on places of less than 10 acres from which sales of farm products amounted to $250 or more in 1959.

Migration

The substantial shifts in percentages of the population classified as urban, rural, rural farm, and rural non-farm, indicate the heavy out-migration of farm-reared people but they still do not convey the full impact of what has happened year in and year out in agriculture. From 1960 to 1966, the net out-migration from farms averaged 804,000 persons per year. The number was down from the yearly average of 1,013,000 from 1950 to 1960. The figure for the 60's is smaller only because the base from which the migrants are drawn is smaller. There seems to be no slackening in the rate of migration. Net farm migration expressed as a percentage of the average annual farm population was:

-5.7% from 1960-65 and

-5.3% from 1950-60[6]

The out-migration in the 60's has been about the same as during the period of World War II.

The President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty concluded:

> "The gradual reduction in the number of persons leaving farms has somewhat eased the impact of such migration on receiving areas, but the relative impact on the sending farm communities is as high as it has ever been."[7]

Regional Changes

The urbanization of the United States as measured by the growth of the urban population has occurred in all regions but at different rates. Some of the major conclusions that may be drawn about regional changes are these:[8]

> the Northeast has been predominantly urban since 1880 and the North Central and the West since 1920
>
> the South did not become urban until 1960 following the large decline, 40% in its farm population, during the decade of the 50's
>
> the East South Central states (Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi) comprise the only region which still had more or its people in rural than in urban areas in 1960

---

6. Op. Cit., pages 3-4
7. Op. Cit., page 4
8. Loc. Cit.

rural population losses of 10% or more in the 50's occurred in the interior central plain of the lower south from Georgia through Texas, in the Great Plains from Texas to Nebraska, in the Allegheny Plateau, the Ozarks, and in the marginal corn belt areas in Iowa and Missouri

It is significant that there were areas of sizable rural population increase which developed both from net migration and natural increase. Gains of more than 10% occurred in Florida, California and Nevada as a result of the boom characteristics of these states and in the hinterlands of the industrial areas in the Great Lakes states and on the Atlantic Seaboard.

But for the most part, areas which experienced gains in rural population experienced large farm population losses at the same time. The revival of rural growth is not associated with rural primary industries but with some dispersal of manufacturing and commuting to urban employment.

Participation in the Labor Force -- Industrial and Occupational Composition[9]

The rural labor force, persons 14 years of age or older working or actively looking for work, is estimated to be some 20 million or about one-fourth of the total labor force. Workers on farms were about 7% and those classified as non-farm some 18% of the total work force.

About 51% of the rural population as compared with 57% of the urban population were in the work force in 1960. This was in large part due to the smaller proportion of rural women as contrasted with urban women who worked for pay.

---

9. Op. Cit., pages 6-8

This factor seems to be changing. Women now constitute 26% of the rural work force, where it was only 16% in 1940.

White men and non-white women are more likely to be in the work force. There are many reasons for this, including rebuffs which have led non-white men to stop seeking jobs in rural areas. Non-white women are more likely to head households and to have to work.

The changes in the occupation and industry mix in the rural labor force is making it more and more like the urban labor force. These seem to be the more significant changes:

1. farming and laboring occupations have declined
2. employment in extractive industries has declined

But employment has increased in:

manufacturing, various types of trades and services and

all other occupations

The industrial composition of the rural work force breaks down something like this:

6 out of 10 farm residents in 1960 worked in agriculture

On the other hand, in the rural non-farm population

about 1/4 was employed in manufacturing; another 1/4 was employed in the service industries including education, hospitals, public administration; about 1/5 was employed in various trades

The occupational composition can be summarized as follows:

> In the non-farm population, half the men work at blue collar jobs, 1/4 at white collar jobs, and about 1 in 10 in farm work
>
> Among farm residents, 6 in 10 worked in agriculture and the majority of the rest worked in blue collar occupations
>
> Among farm women, on the other hand, only 1/4 worked in agriculture and the rest worked in blue collar and service occupations
>
> Only in the clerical occupations were women farm residents employed in substantially smaller proportions than women in non-farm areas[10]

Substantial differences exist in the employment of white and non-white women. Service jobs, primarily domestic jobs, dominate the non-white female labor force in all areas. A much larger proportion of non-white women are employed on farms as compared with white women and a substantially smaller proportion in blue collar and white collar jobs.

Age and Sex Composition[11]

There are more males than females in both the rural farm and the rural non-farm populations. The proportion of men per 100 women breaks down as follows:

> 107 men per 100 women in the rural farm population
>
> 103 men per 100 women in the rural non-farm population
>
> 94 men per 100 women in the urban population

---

10. Op. Cit., page 8

11. Op. Cit., pages 5-6

The age structure of the farm population is heavily influenced by the continuing out-migration of young people. Despite this fact, the median age of the rural population is lower than that of the urban. The figures in 1960 were:

27.3 years of age for the total rural population, and

30.4 years for the urban

From 1950-60 the median age for the farm population went up from 26.3 to 29.6 years.

The farm population has had and still has a disproportionately large number of people under 18 and a very small young adult group 18-34 years of age. Perhaps the best way of getting at the differences in the number of children is to look at the number of children ever born per 1,000 women. About 2,130 children per 1,000 women are needed for population replacement. The percentages above replacement levels are as follows:

urban - 7%

rural non-farm - 40%

rural farm - 55%

While the replacement rates will likely decline among rural farm and rural non-farm women, they have a long way to decline.

Closely related to age is the dependency ratio or the ratio of children under 15 and older people over 65 to the population aged 20-64. In 1960, for every 1,000 productive aged people, the dependent aged were

urban - 727, including 559 children and 168 older people

rural - 863, including 680 children and 183 older persons

Educational Achievement

There is a great volume of data on the educational achievement of the American population. Only a very brief and sketchy summary is attempted in this paper.

Data on the number of school years completed by the adult population reflect events that happened in the past and substantial differences between urban, rural non-farm, and rural farm people that persisted in 1960. Urban people generally had completed more years of schooling with rural non-farm next and the farm people the lowest.[12]

There were also substantial regional and racial variations. The order by region was:

West - highest in years of schooling completed by the adult population

North East

North Central

South - lowest[13]

Non-whites had completed fewer years of education than whites for all the reasons we are now beginning to understand.

School enrollment data for 16-17 year olds are somewhat more current. These data show relatively small differences in enrollment rates by residence and there were no important differences between urban and farm youth.[14] Differ-

---

12. Op. Cit., page 156

13. Op. Cit., page 158

14. Loc. Cit.

ences among regions were a little greater. They were in this order.

West - highest in the enrollment of 16-17 year olds

North Central

North East

South - lowest

White-non-white differences had declined. They were almost negligible in the south and tended to be larger in the North East.

Data on test performances such as verbal and non-verbal ability, reading comprehension and mathematical achievement are still more up-to-date. Data for 1967 show small differences favoring metropolitan over non-metropolitan students. Northern students tended to score higher than those of the South East and the South West.[15]

Some important trends seem to be occurring. Rural-urban differences in school enrollment in pre-college levels are no longer very pronounced. Regional differences seem to be declining. Racial differences are dropping also. It is difficult to say with any degree of certainty, however, that "learning gaps" are being closed![16]

Substantial differences persist in educational achievement along residence, regional and racial lines. Especially significant are the gaps between the rural South and South East and the major minority groups and all the rest of the population. To some extent, the persisting differences can be accounted for in the

---

15. Op. Cit., page 159

16. Loc. Cit

quality of educational facilities and personnel. Social-psychological factors,[17] however, must also be taken into account such as:

the influence of others, particularly significant other persons to the student

socio-economic factors

level of occupational aspiration

parental encouragement for college attendance

college plans on the part of the student

one's conception of his ability to learn, and

ability

These factors in turn are influenced by the overall environment and the importance given to education.

Income and Poverty

The incomes of rural farm and rural non-farm families are substantially below those of urban families. The median incomes for the two rural groups compared with the median for all families for 1959 are:[18]

rural farm - 59%

rural non-farm - 84%

Two major factors affect the income of the rural people

1. earning capacities are low, and
2. incomes attained are below earning capacity

---

17. Op. Cit., page 168
18. Op. Cit., pages 10-11

This simply means that there are large numbers of people in rural areas who have low levels of job skills and who are either unemployed or more likely underemployed.

Income and the productivity of a farm enterprise are obviously closely related. It is only on farms with gross sales of $20,000 or more that any measure of income parity as measured by the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty was attained.[19] Great increases in the size of farm businesses over those that prevail now would be required to achieve any substantial improvement in the income of farm operators.

It is a shocking fact that there are 14 million rural Americans who are poor and a high number of these can be described as destitute. It is surprising also that proportionately there are more poor people in the rural population than in the urban:[20]

> 40% of the nation's poor live in rural areas -- some 3 million families and 1 million unattached persons
>
> > of the 14 million poor, 11 million are white, while at the same time a higher proportion of non-whites are poor
> >
> > > 3 out of 5 non-white persons are poor and 90% of them are clustered in the poorest counties in the country

---

19. Op. Cit., page 11

20. The People Left Behind, a report by the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, Washington, D.C., September 1967, page 3

The percent of the population who are poor among various residence classifications are:[21]

	% poor
farm	29.3
rural total	25.0
non-farm	23.6
small cities	23.6
U.S. total	17.7
central cities	17.4
total urban	14.8
metropolitan areas	12.6
suburbs	6.7

Poverty is scattered throughout the population and throughout the regions of the country. Heaviest concentrations occur however in the:

South

Indian Reservations in the Southwest, the upper Great Plains, and the West

New England, and

the upper Great Lakes

Within the South, there are heavy concentrations in:

---

21. Op. Cit., page 3

Appalachia

the coastal plain east of Appalachia

the Ozarks

the Black Belt of the Old South

the Mexican-American areas along the Southern border of the U.S.

This is an almost overwhelming body of data to take into account when one considers the papers that have been previously presented. You face a tremendous challenge. However, much of this data is not unfamiliar to you. It highlights for us all the need which led to this conference -- getting on with solving educational problems in sparsely settled areas. This is a task that cannot be neglected.

III. SOME BASIC PROBLEMS CONFRONTING RURAL COMMUNITIES

Attention can now be centered on some of the problems confronting villages and small places as communities. A prior question, however, is what is happening to rural villages or incorporated places under 2,500 in non-metropolitan United States. Fortunately, an analysis of the rural villages was made as part of the report of the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty.[22] A balance sheet was drawn for the period 1950-60. The trends and the number of villages are indicated in these figures:[23]

---

22. Ibid., Rural Poverty in the United States, pages 51-73

23. Op. Cit., page 53

	Number of villages
1950	11,162
Change 1950-60	
Gains -- new places	523
Decline from a larger size	51
Losses -- growth to a larger size	312
Drop outs	129
1960	11,295
Increase in number of villages 1960 over 1950	133

These figures indicate a slight gain of 133 incorporated villages under 2,500 population over the ten year period. It would seem that villages are not disappearing. There is a very slight gain in their number.

Perhaps the most significant facts about villages of concern to educational planners and other planners are these:[24]

villages have: a smaller number of children
a smaller proportion of adults in their working years, and
a substantially larger number of older and dependent people

An age structure of this kind immediately raises questions as to the maintenance of a tax base from which to provide services and the development of leadership to solve critical rural problems. Despite its staying power, villages face major obstacles in adjusting in an increasingly urbanizing and industrializing nation.

---

24. Op. Cit., page 72

Some Major Dilemmas of a Small Community

American society as a whole faces severe problems in attaining on the one hand a sense of community and on the other a sense of individual integrity and identity. It may well be that these are so interdependent that it is impossible to gain one without the other.

Much has been written about the lack of community and the lack of identity in the city. A major question for us at this point in time is whether or not, with the powerful urbanization processes that have been at work, the small town and rural area may be the most isolated and alienated parts of our society. The rural community that once caught up the lives of its residents seems to be far removed now from where the action is and to constitute a kind of eddy or sidestream in relation to the mainstream of American life.

However we may answer this question, there does seem to be some built-in dilemmas for the small community. These were highlighted in the valuable study called Small Town in Mass Society by Arthur Vidich and Joseph Bensman.[25] I have revalidated these a number of times in my own work. Four major dilemmas seem to be:

1. the goal of success as defined by the larger culture and the larger society and the inaccessibility of means for success for many young people within the small community

2. the small community is portrayed as a warm, friendly, hospitable place. On occasions, it is; on other occasions, it seems to devalue other people in accounting for one's relative success or lack of it.

---

25. Arthur J. Vidich and Joseph Bensman, Small Town in Mass Society, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1958

3. the illusion of democratic control and widespread participation in the face of the operation of tightly controlled power and influence structures in the hands of a few people or a few families

4. the illusion of autonomy and local independence in the face of high dependence on outside institutions and resources.

These dilemmas underlie much of what happens in a rural or small community and must be taken into account in any kind of planning and particularly in educational planning.

Some of the Effects

The forces, the basic data presented, have had some other effects which also must be taken into account. These forces create pressures upon us as individuals and complicate the environment within which we must work, which in turn enhance pressure still more.

It is now evident that one of the significant achievements of American society and American communities has become a substantial weakness -- that is, the creation of specialized competence and the placing of this competence in specialized organizations and agencies. This came about in a natural and seemingly ordered way in both the public and private sectors. What has not been recognized until very recently is that the development and provision of specialized competence has led to three classical forms of isolation and estrangement:

the separation and isolation of agencies from each other

the separation and isolation from the community

the estrangement of agencies from both the people they serve and those they might potentially serve[26]

Many factors have contributed to this isolation. Once agencies were established they became possessive of programs or areas of work. This was their "property" and they were defensive about any intrusion by other agencies or by the community. At the same time, the community and other agencies more or less assigned responsibility for particular programs to an agency. Frequently the community was pleased to be rid of it as a general responsibility.

The isolation of agencies from each other and from the community, together with specialization and professionalization of the agency staffs, led to an estrangement from the people served or to be served. This estrangement was further increased by conceptions of the helping function which tended to force people receiving help into a paralyzing pacivity.

What has emerged within each community, then, is an enormously complex array of specialized organizations, programs and services with a built-in dilemma of major proportions. On the one hand, there is the array of public and private services with inter-connections between the local and national levels; and on the other, both at the community and national levels, there is difficulty in relating these services to each other in such a way that an effective

---

26. Edward O. Moe, "The University and the Community," a presentation to a conference on The University and Community Services, University of Arizona, January 1969

attack can be made on significant problems. These problems may be rehabilitation, poverty, unemployment, education or youth services, or they may be the composite difficulties confronting neighborhoods or communities. In either case, the problems usually transcend the services of any specific organization and demand the cooperation and articulation of many services and the work of many agencies.

Not only is this a major difficulty for individuals and communities, it is also a problem for institutions and agencies offering services. Under conditions which now exist, it is almost impossible for an agency working alone to achieve its own program objectives. To be most effective, each must relate what it does to the work of other agencies and organizations. This is true in any community. It is particularly true in the rural community with the difficult problems it faces both in lack of services on the one hand and the lack of financial resources on the other.

These forms of isolation and separation within the community concern the school as much or more than any other institution or agency. This is the complex of problems which American society and American communities, including rural society and rural communities, confront.

CONCLUSION

Educational systems and the schools cannot solve their problems apart from or isolated from the community of which they are a part. It is leadership

such as you bring to this task that enables us to grapple with the future. In times of change, we can, with imagination, help to determine the direction of change and help to shape the nature of the change that occurs. If we have a clear and firm view of what the rural school should be and what role education should play in the future, perhaps we can come into the present from the future as well as from the past.

Division of Community & Urban Development
University of Utah
February 21, 1969